

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. By this Response, claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendment and foregoing remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britt, Jr. (US 2002/0032785 A1) in view of Fukasawa et al. (US 6,738,822 B2) and claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Britt, Fukasawa and applicant submitted prior art. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a communication network system comprising a content server; a portal server; and a conversion/formatting server disposed in a communication link between said content server and said portal server, for converting contents information which said conversion/formatting server has acquired from said content server into contents information in a predetermined format, formatting the contents information in the predetermined format into contents information suitable for display on the communication terminal equipment in response to a request from said portal server, and transmitting the formatted contents information to said portal server.

As recited in claim 1, the present invention includes three separate servers, a portal server, a content server and a conversion/formatting server. The portal server and the content server communicate with each other through the conversion/formatting server. Each communication between the content server

and portal server is first sent to the conversion/formatting server which converts the received data from the content server to the appropriate format for use by a display in the portal server.

The Office Action alleges that Britt teaches the claimed content server and portal server. The Office Action alleges that Britt fails to teach a conversion server as claimed and alleges Fukasawa provides this teaching absent in Britt. The Office Action alleges the combination of Britt and Fukasawa provide applicants claimed invention. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Britt teaches a system for providing access to a server via a wireless computing device. Britt teaches the use of a portal server 110 that is in communication with other network servers 130. In Britt the conversion update is performed within the portal server 110 by the conversion module 920. See paragraphs 34 and 35. Thus, although Britt teaches the portal server 110 being in communication with other servers 130, the other servers most likely would not perform conversion of data as claimed, since Britt teaches conversion being performed by the portal server 110.

Further, combining Fukasawa's teachings with Britt does not lead to the present invention as claimed. Fukasawa teaches a system that provides communication between a video client and a video server. A conversion server 101 receives a request from the video client, converts the message into a format for the server. The converted message is then transmitted to the server. Messages sent from the video server to the video client are likewise formatted by the conversion server. See column 4, lines 59-67 to column 5, lines 1-40.

Although Fukasawa teaches the use of a conversion server, Fukasawa does not teach or suggest implementing a conversion server disposed in a communication link between a portal server and a content server for converting data. At best, Fukasawa teaches implementing a conversion server between a client terminal and a server.

Further, one of ordinary skill would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Fukasawa with Britt. As stated above, Britt teaches conversion of data within the portal server itself. One of ordinary skill would not implement a conversion server within Britt system to provide converted data to the portal server, since Britt teaches to the contrary by converting data within the portal server itself. Simply stated, no motivation is found within the references themselves or by one of ordinary skill to combine Fukasawa's teachings with Britt's teachings.

Thus, the combination of Britt and Fukasawa fail to teach each and every feature of claim 1 as required. Moreover, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Britt and Fukasawa.

Further, applicant admitted prior art fails to make up for Britt and Fukasawa's deficiencies. Therefore, dependent claims 2-13 are likewise distinguishable over the combination of references for the above reasons.

Thus, in view of the above, applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings (Reg. No. 48,917) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/CJB:cb
1163-0356P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000